

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 4-31 and 35-73 were pending. No claims have been added, amended, or canceled. Thus, claims 4-31 and 35-73 remain pending.

Claims 4-31 and 35-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,934,697 to Warren in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,916,310 to McCain.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is allowable as Warren and McCain, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 4. For example, claim 4 recites "*an application development system configured to generate the metadata, the metadata being further configured to characterize a user customizable immediate access keystroke combination associated with the user interface element.*" The rejection states that "Warren fails to distinctly point out an application development system and a configuration system for a keystroke combination" (Office Action page 3).

McCain is directed at a method of using function keys in an HTML document. *See McCain*, col. 3 lines 44-46. Neither HTML documents nor browsers for viewing these documents otherwise implement function keys. *Id.*, col. 2 lines 32-33. In McCain, an HTML page 25 has Javascript application 50 and a URL to a Java applet 48. *Id.*, col. 5 lines 62-63. The Java applet 48 maintains focus and intercepts all user-entered keystrokes. The applet 48 sends the keystrokes to the application 50, which implements "the predetermined, enhanced functionality of each particular user-entered keystroke." *Id.*, col. 6 lines 46-52. Although McCain does mention other keys, such as the edit keys of delete and home, McCain does not disclose or suggest a keystroke that does not have a predetermined function or that can be customized by a user. *Id.*, col. 8 lines 5-9. In contrast, claim 4 recites "a user customizable immediate access keystroke combination associated with the user interface element." Accordingly, McCain cannot render claim 4 obvious, either alone or in combination with Warren.

Applicant submits that independent claims 5, 8, 14, 19, 27, 35, 39, 44, 48, 53, 56, 62, 68, 71, 72, and 73 should be allowable for at least the same rationale as discussed with respect to claim 4. Claims 6-7 depend from claim 5; claims 9-13 depend from claim 8; claims 15-18 depend from claim 14; claims 20-26 depend from claim 19; claims 28-31 depend from claim 27; claims 36-38 depend from claim 35; claims 40-43 depend from claim 39; claims 45-47 depend from claim 44; claims 49-52 depend from claim 48; claims 54-55 depend from claim 53; claims 57-61 depend from claim 56; claims 63-67 depend from claim 62; and claims 69-70 depend from claim 68 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 4-31 and 35-73 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



David Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

Dated: February 17, 2006

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
BNY/llc/jtc/sfs
60600835 v1